

# boundaries

A GUIDE FOR PROPERTY OWNERS AND INSURERS IN A LITIGIOUS SOCIETY

05.28.10

## “New” Supreme Court Rules In Favor Of Landowner!

By Mark Masters

In *Kachudas v. Invaders Self Auto Wash, Inc.*, \_ Mich \_ (2010), the Supreme Court held that an icy condition on the premises was open and obvious, and that there was no independent claim for negligence which would survive.

In *Kachudas*, an icy condition was allegedly created from spraying water outdoors in freezing temperatures at Defendant’s self-serve car wash. Plaintiff was allegedly injured by slipping on the icy condition, and sued under premises liability and general negligence theories. In recent years, claimants have argued (with some success) that the open and obvious defense would not apply to separate claims of ordinary negligence, but only to premises liability theories of recovery.

The trial court dismissed the entire case on the open and obvious defense, but the Court of Appeals reversed in part, holding that Plaintiff’s claims sounding in negligence were not subject to dismissal based on the open and obvious defense, which only applies to premises liability claims.

The Supreme Court held that the trial court correctly recognized that this was simply a premises liability case despite Plaintiff’s attempts to characterize it otherwise. The Supreme Court held:

“Although an injured person may pursue a claim in ordinary negligence for the overt acts of a premises owner on his or her premises, the Plaintiff in this case is alleging injury by a condition on the land, and as such, his claim sounds exclusively in premises liability.”

### SECRET WARDLE NOTES:

This decision is quite a surprise from our “new” Supreme Court. Most (if not all) commentators agree that the current configuration of the Court favors plaintiffs rather than defendants.

Here, the Court had the opportunity to essentially eliminate the open and obvious defense by allowing mere allegations of a general negligence claim to survive in a case which would otherwise be dismissed under the defense.

This opinion certainly reached the right result, but it is a surprise to many. The future of Michigan law may not be as bleak for Defendants as originally feared.

## CONTINUED...

In regard to the application of the open and obvious defense to the facts of this case, the Supreme Court further held:

“In addition, the circuit court properly ruled that the alleged hazardous condition was open and obvious, because a reasonably prudent average user of ordinary intelligence spraying water outdoors in a temperature range of 11 to 24 degrees would anticipate the likelihood of freezing and the resulting danger therefrom.”

This was a 4-2-1 decision. Justices Cavanagh and Kelly dissented in part. They believed that this was truly a premises liability case rather than a general negligence case. Therefore, the open and obvious defense would apply to the whole claim. However, they felt that there was a “question of fact” regarding the open and obvious issue which should be resolved by a jury. Justice Hathaway issued a separate dissent in which she felt that the Court of Appeals was correct.

## CONTACT US

### **Farmington Hills**

30903 Northwestern Highway, P.O. Box 3040  
Farmington Hills, MI 48333-3040  
Tel: 248-851-9500 Fax: 248-851-2158

### **Mt. Clemens**

94 Macomb Place, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043-5651  
Tel: 586-465-7180 Fax: 586-465-0673

### **Lansing**

6639 Centurion Drive, Ste. 130, Lansing, MI 48917  
Tel: 517-886-1224 Fax: 517-886-9284

### **Grand Rapids**

2025 East Beltline, S.E., Ste. 209, Grand Rapids, MI 49546  
Tel: 616-285-0143 Fax: 616-285-0145

[www.secrestwardle.com](http://www.secrestwardle.com)

SECRET  
**SW**  
WARDLE

Copyright 2010 Secrest, Wardle, Lynch, Hampton,  
Truex and Morley, P.C.

This newsletter is published for the purpose of providing information and does not constitute legal advice and should not be considered as such. This newsletter or any portion of this newsletter is not to be distributed or copied without the express written consent of Secrest Wardle.

## CONTRIBUTORS

### **Premises Liability Practice Group Chair**

Mark F. Masters

### **Premises Liability Practice Group Co-Chair**

Caroline Grech-Clapper

### **Editor**

Bonny Craft

We welcome your questions and comments.

## OTHER MATERIALS

If you would like to be on the distribution list for Boundaries, or for newsletters pertaining to any of our other practice groups, please contact Secrest Wardle Marketing at [swsubscriptions@secrestwardle.com](mailto:swsubscriptions@secrestwardle.com) or 248-539-2850.

### **Other newsletters include:**

**Benchmarks** – Navigating the hazards of legal malpractice

**Blueprints** – Mapping legal solutions for the construction industry

**Community Watch** – Breaking developments in governmental litigation

**Contingencies** – A guide for dealing with catastrophic property loss

**Fair Use** – Protecting ideas in a competitive world

**In the Margin** – Charting legal trends affecting businesses

**Industry Line** – Managing the hazards of environmental toxic tort litigation

**Landowner's Alert** – Defense strategies for property owners and managers

**No-Fault Newslite** – A road map for motor vehicle insurers and owners

**On the Beat** – Responding to litigation affecting law enforcement

**On the Job** – Tracking developments in employment law

**Safeguards** – Helping insurers protect their clients

**Standards** – A guide to avoiding risks for professionals

**State of the Art** – Exploring the changing face of product liability

**Structures** – A framework for defending architects and engineers

**Vital Signs** – Diagnosing the changing state of medical malpractice and nursing home liability